

T. ADAMIK

## PLINY AND MARTIAL

(Epist. 3,21)

1. In this paper we shall scrutinise the well-known letter of Pliny written on the occasion of Martial's death. The letter 3,21 is an important document not only because it came into being in the year of the poet's death.<sup>1</sup> Wishing to render perceptible the importance of that fact, it is sufficient to hint at Juvenal, whose first appreciation was offered by Servius about 400<sup>2</sup>. Pliny's letter is also significant for its influence upon the appreciation of the poet's personality and works from the age of the humanists up to our days.

The publishers and biographers who were fond of Martial and wanted to endear him to the readers, either published the letter of Pliny instead of an introduction<sup>3</sup> or borrowed from it in order to increase the authority of the poet. In *Vita Martialis*, written in 1505, Petrus Crinitus emphasizes that Pliny had a high opinion of Martial: *Relata sunt a Caecilio Plinio permulta de ingenio et eruditione Valerii Martialis: quibus satis colligere possumus quanti fecerit hunc ipsum poetam, quantumque illius versibus oblectari consequit.* Great honours were conferred upon him — continues Petrus Crinitus: *Neque dubium est, illum Romae publicis honoribus ornatum atque honestatum fuisse.*<sup>4</sup> In the Matthaeus Raderus edition, published in 1627, we read the following sentence: *Omnium nobilissimum testatissimumque est C. Plinii Caecilii Secundi, poetae aequalis et amici, cuius iudicium merito tanti fit ab omnibus, quanti Plinius hic ipse ab omnibus fieri solet, cuius ad Cornelium Priscum Epistolam de Martiale apponam.*<sup>5</sup> These authors regard Martial as a knight of prestige and a gifted poet, and they support their opinion with Pliny's letter. Although from the 19th century onward, the reputation of Martial has been more and more decreasing, nevertheless, there have been scholars who, simply by referring to the letter of Pliny, esteemed our poet, e. g. D. Nisard calls him *homme candide et bon.*<sup>6</sup> R. Syme underlines that Pliny praises the poet in the last lines of his letter.<sup>7</sup> I. Borzsák considers him as a good poet and a candid man.<sup>8</sup>

It is noteworthy, on the other hand, that the authors who present Martial as bad poet and a nobody also refer to Pliny's letter, making us feel that Pliny held a hard opinion of the poet. Raphael Volaterranus — one

year after the publishing of Petrus Crinitus' *Vita Martialis* — writes about the poet as follows: (Martialis) *Romae annos triginta commoratus, in Hispaniam demum revertit, pauper admodum, et viatico a Plinio, ut in eius epistola declaratur, adjutus; reliquit epigrammatum librum omnino rejiciendum, quippe neque elegantiae Latinae neque moribus prosit.*<sup>9</sup> Nor had Andrea Navagero a better opinion of him: every year he burnt the books of Martial in public.<sup>10</sup> G. Bernhardt,<sup>11</sup> E. Paratore<sup>12</sup> and L. Bieler<sup>13</sup> draw on him in the same spirit. O. Seel states his view even more cuttingly declaring that Pliny disdained the poet: "Für ihn war Martial der stadtbekannte Witzkopf und Bettelpoet, der seine petits riens den hochmögenden Herren ins Haus schickte, um sie zu vergnügen und dafür klingenden Lohn einzuheimsen; nur wenig besser als ein Parasit und Hoffnarr."<sup>14</sup> From the above-mentioned opinions it is obvious that the appreciation of Pliny's letter is contradictory, and this is what gives us motives to examine this document anew.

2. J. W. Duff writes about the importance of the Roman rhetorical education as follows: "The main clue to the literary qualities of Silver Latin is to be found in education, and particularly in rhetorical education."<sup>15</sup> We need not emphasize that Pliny was an eminent rhetor and stylist, therefore we must regard his lines about Martial as a manifestation of a literary critic. When he writes about Martial: *Erat homo ingeniosus, acutus, acer, et qui plurimum in scribendo et salis haberet et fellis, nec cando-ris minus*, he seems to make a difference between the man and the poet, and he portrays both of them separately. However, in reality, when he speaks about the man, he uses stylistic terms.

In Latin literary criticism when appreciating a poet's achievements a central question was the existence of *ingenium* and *ars*, and their relation to each other. According to Horace both are necessary for making a good poet: *Natura fieret laudabile carmen, an arte, | quaesitum est. Ego nec studium sine divite vena, | nec rude quid prosit video ingenium* (*Ars poet.* 408–410). Cicero, too, judges the poetic accomplishment of Lucretius in this respect: *Lucreti poemata, ut scribis, ita sunt, multis luminibus ingenii, multae tamen artis* (*ad Quint. fr.* 2, 9,3). But Pliny himself, in the obituary of Silius Italicus, appreciates his talent from this point of view: (Silius Italicus) *scribebat carmina maiore cura quam ingenio* (3, 7, 5), i. e. in the poetic works of Silius there was more formalistic care than innate talent. Despite of this, he calls Martial *ingeniosus*, i. e. a poet in whom there is native ingenuity.

Important information is carried by the second attribute *acutus* which may have the meaning of *pointed, sharp, shrill, keen*.<sup>16</sup> But, perhaps our author does not use it here in these common meanings, but as a stylistic term. The theory of the three styles is discussed by all the ancient rhetors. Contemporary of Martial, Quintillianus sketches it out as follows: *unum subtile, ... alterum grande atque robustum, ... tertium alii medium ex duobus, alii floridum addiderunt* (12, 10,58). He determines, too, what each style serves for: *primum docendi, secundum movendi, tertium illud, utrocumque est nomine, delectandi sive, ut alii dicunt, conciliandi*



*praestare videatur officium; in docendo autem acumen, in conciliando lenitas, in movendo vis exigi videatur.* With the attribute *acutus* Pliny wants to say that Martial is a didactic poet, too, and as such a poet, he is a follower of the simple style. Naturally, it also means that he is an adherent of short poetry.

The third attribute, *acer* can be used in the meaning of *sharp, fierce, keen, acute* etc. In another letter by Pliny it seems this word is employed in connection with an invective written by Novius Maximus. His work is: *opus pulchrum, validum, acre, sublime* (4, 20,2), and as appears in the first letter of Book 9, it is a political pamphlet. The adjective *acer*, concerning Martial, hints at the satirical character of the poet, and so does the expression *plurimum salis et fellis*, the *fel* refers to the scathing irony, the *sal* — to the wittiness. These words show that Pliny recognized the satirical side of Martial's poetry, and esteemed it. In this respect he does not stand alone in antiquity. In one of his long poems Sidonius Apollinaris portrays his poet-ancestors very briefly and strikingly, and he writes about Martial: *mordax sine fine Martialis*<sup>17</sup> (c. 9,268).

The meaning of the utterance *nec candoris minus* is disputable. Nisard translates it as *non moins de candeur*, i. e. he interprets *candor* as honesty, goodness.<sup>18</sup> According to K. — H. Mehnert with *candor* Pliny wanted to emphasise the *Atticum lepos*, with *sal* and *fel* the *sal Romanus*.<sup>19</sup> Nisard's interpretation may be allowed by the meaning of *candor*. Georges' dictionary illustrating in *candor* the meaning of *honesty* brings up just this place of Pliny, and translates it as *nec minus candoris -- und dabei der redlichste (beste) Mensch*.<sup>20</sup> But *candor* is to be found as a stylistic term, too. Praising the style of Livy Quintilianus says: *in narrando mirae iucunditatis clarissimique candoris* (10,1,101) — and in this context the *candor* means the limidity of the style, the limpidity of the descriptions and the characterizations. We think that Pliny employs *candor* in a stylistic sense, as well. Summing up the interpretations we think that in the analysed sentence Pliny says that Martial was a gifted poet, and a partisan of the short poetry written in „slender“ style.

We wonder if we can find in Martial's epigrams phrases supporting the above-mentioned interpretations of Pliny's statement. Martial underlines the satirical character of his epigrams so that we may omit it. But the problems of simple style and short poetry deserve attention. In his epigrams Martial avoids even the appearance of learned attitude, but this does not preclude the possibility of his employing literary critical terms in a natural, refined and hidden way, if he considers it to be necessary. F. Quadlbauer — in an interesting study — claims that the term *fons purus* in the ancient stylistical literature denoted the simple style, the *flumen magnum* — the sublime style.<sup>21</sup> He also reveals that Martial must have known these terms and employed them, presumably as stylistic terms; the term *sana* characterizes the short poetry, the attribute *vesica* the high-flown great poetry.

We assume that the number of the stylistic terms revealed in Martial by Quadlbauer can be increased. Horace formulates his style-ideal so:

*vemens et liquidus puroque simillimus amni* (Epist. 2,2,120). He experienced the contrary of this in Lucilius who dictated 200 lines in an hour, but his style was *lutulentus* (Serm. 1,4,9–10). Defending the short kind of poetry against the great one, Martial reproaches his opponent with the same: he creates his giant out of mud:

*Nos facimus Bruti puerum, nos Langona vivum:  
tu magnus luteum, Gaure, Giganta facis* (9,50).

Martial's poetry is short, but it describes living men, and in form it is polished and complete, like the famous small statue named *Bruti puer*.<sup>22</sup>

Similarly, Horace mentions that the *Parca* has given him simple style (*tenuis spiritus*): *spiritum Graiae tenuem Camenae / Parca non mendax dedit* (carm. 2,16,38)<sup>23</sup>. Relating to a friendly competition Martial writes that his friend defeats him in distributing presents and in writing verses, because he is *tenuis* in both respects. With the attribute *tenuis* the poet partly hints at his modest financial status, and partly at the short poetry cultivated by him. He employs the word *tenuis* related to Catullus, too, in stylistic sense: *nec sua plus debet tenui Verona Catullo* (10,103,5).

When he decided, after composing seven books of epigrams, that he would write only epigrams henceforth, he justified his resolution with the words:

*Angusta cantare licet videaris avena,  
dum tua multorum vincat avena tubas* (8,3,21–22).

In these lines the *angusta avena* denotes the simple epigrammatical poetry, the *tuba* — the high-flown epical works.

Since the publication of Vergil's eclogues the *avena* has become the technical term of the short poetry written in simple style:

*Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi  
silvestram tenui Musam meditaris avena* (1,1–2).

It is a well-known fact that the ancient and medieval stylists regarded Vergil's eclogues as the best pattern of the simple style.

The fact that relating to his poetry Martial employs terms used by Vergil and Horace in order to formulate their own aesthetic requirements, shows, partly, what he considers realisable for himself out of the works of these two poets, partly, that he has claimed for his works the aesthetic purity of Vergilian and Horatian poetry, naturally, inside the framework of the genre of the epigram.

3. Insisting on Martial's poverty, scholars refer, generally, to the following phrase in Pliny's letter: *Prosecutus eram viatico secendetem*, i. e. Pliny gave *viaticum* to the poet leaving Rome, and he says why: *dederam hoc amicitiae, dederam etiam versiculis, quos de me composuit* — i. e. in friendship, on the one hand, and for the verses written about him, on the other. Pliny regards the ancient and venerable custom of the recompensation of the poets as magnificent, and he underlines that in connection with Martial: *Fuit moris antiqui eos, qui vel singulorum laudes vel urbium scripse-*



*rant, aut honoribus aut pecunia ornare; nostris vero temporibus ut alia speciosa et egregia ita hoc in primis exolevit.* The next line emphasises once more that he presents the poet on gratitude as honorarium for the poems written about him: *Quaeris, qui sint versiculi, quibus gratiam rettuli.* In the letter we cannot find any allusion saying that the poet asked Pliny for money, and that without his aid he could not have left for Bilbilis. Instead of that Pliny writes about the rewarding of the poets, and he ranks Martial with the ancient poets who received distinctions and material allotments.<sup>24</sup>

However, according to the evidence of Pliny's letter he gave presents not only to poor people. Namely, he presented not only Martial, but others, too, with rather big sums of money. In 1,19 Pliny gives 300 000 sesterces to Firmius, who was his compatriot and school-fellow, because Firmius had only 100 000 sesterces, and Pliny wanted to make him a knight. In 2,4 he promises to Calvina 100 000 sesterces as a dowry, in addition he remits other debts of big sums, and he does that *adfiniatis officio* (2). In 3,11 he mentions the philosopher Artemidoros, at whose disposal he places a big amount of money, because he has loved him for a long time: *cum admiratione dilexi et Artemidorum ipsum iam tum, cum in Syria militarem* (5). In 7,11 we learn, that he sold an estate to Corellia for 700 000 sesterces, because she had taken a liking to it. But the estate is worth more, and Corellia wants to pay, at any price, 900 000 sesterces for it. But Pliny remains firm: he does not accept the surplus 200 000 sesterces. The reason for this decision is his being very fond of Corellia.

We could provide still some more examples but, we think, the above-mentioned ones are sufficient to illustrate that Pliny gave presents many times and big sums: the smallest being 50 000 sesterces, the biggest 300 000 or even more. The other important fact is that the majority of the presented persons belonged to Pliny's own social class, and they were on intimate terms with him. Out of these facts we may draw two important conclusions: a) the sum of the *viaticum* cannot have been small, b) the social status of Martial cannot have been so humble as some scholars suppose.<sup>25</sup>

4. The scholars who think that Pliny disdained Martial argue that Pliny denied Martial's immorality. Giving reason for their statement, they cite the following sentence of Pliny: *Atton erunt aeterna, quae scripsit.* But, in our opinion, we may not take this sentence out of the context, for it is in close connection with the preceding and following sentences. Those who appreciate this assertion in itself, Paratore,<sup>26</sup> Seel<sup>27</sup> forget that Pliny was a splendid stylist, and for a writer or poet of the Silver Age *variatio* was one of the most important aesthetic requirements. Consequently, in order to appreciate the Pliny-sentence correctly we must keep in mind what Martial wrote about Pliny, because the sentence in question is a response, as it were, by Pliny to the poem written to him by Martial.

Martial — in the poem cited in Pliny's letter — declares only one important statement: the forensic speeches of Pliny could be compared to those of Cicero, i. e. they are immortal:

*Sed ne tempore non tuo disertam  
pulses ebria ianuam videto:  
totos dat tetricae dies Minervae,  
dum centum studet auribus virorum  
hoc, quod saecula posterique possint  
Arpinis quoque conparare chartis* (10,20,12–16).

It is evident that Martial says: Pliny is immortal. But Pliny could not declare the same immediately after these lines, for thus he would have made one believe that Martial was immortal only because earlier Martial had said the same about him. In another letter by Pliny the situation is the same; and he draws the attention of the addressee to the absurdity of the situation: *Si laudatus a te laudare te coepero, vereor, ne non tam proferre iudicium meum quam referre gratiam videar* (9, 8,1). And it would have been also stylistically unvaried if he had simply called him immortal. How more ingenious is the *variatio* on immortality. First he raises the idea of immortality with full definiteness: *Dedit enim mihi, quantum maximum potuit. Daturus amplius, si potuisset. Tametsi quid homini potest dari maius quam gloria et laus et aeternitas*. In the followings the idea of immortality is doubted: *At non erunt aeterna, quae scripsit; non erunt fortasse*. Finally he reassumes the theme of immortality in quite another formulation: *ille tamen scripsit, tamquam essent futura*. That is: the poet himself regards his poetry to be eternal. Pliny places the word *futura* at the end of his letter, imitating the epigrammatic style of the poet. In the Latin sentence the most significant word stands at the end of the sentence. So, the last paragraph of the letter, although modestly, declares that Martial's poetry is enduring.

It is worth comparing the end of this letter to those obituaries written about Silius Italicus and C. Fannius. As it can be seen, Pliny had not such a high opinion about the poetical talent of Silius Italicus. Nevertheless, he may have thought that his literary works would be lasting: in the last paragraph of this letter he writes: *Sed tanto magis hoc, quidquid est temporis futilis et caduci, si non datur factis (nam horum materia in alina manu), certe studiis proferamus et, quatenus nobis denegatur diu vivere, relinquamus aliquid, quo nos vixisse testemur!* (3,7,14). This is an other *variatio* on the idea of immortality. Even more modestly does he declare his views about the work of the Stoic Fannius, nevertheless, he raises the possibility of immortality: *mihi autem videtur acerba semper et immatura mors eorum, qui immortale aliquid parant* (5,5,4). Martial, too, wrote his epigrams *tamquam essent futura*.

5. From the first part of Pliny's letter we may draw the conclusion that Pliny thought Martial to be a good poet, and from such expressions as *moleste fero, dimisi amicissime, amicissimum defunctum esse doleo* it is evident that he was also fond of him. In spite of this, on the question



of the poet's immortality he formulates his thoughts modestly. The reason of this modesty is due — in our opinion — to Martial's view of life. As to the political attitude of Martial we can conclude from the addressees of his epigrams. He was in close connection — we may say: in friendly connection — with the following persons: the poet and orator Arruntius Stella,<sup>28</sup> praetor in 93, cons. suff. in 102; Stertinius Avitus,<sup>29</sup> cons. in 92, he had a sculpture made of the poet; Licinius Sura,<sup>30</sup> diplomat, thrice consul, an intimate friend of Traian's; Appius Maximus Norbanus,<sup>31</sup> the suppressor of the Saturninus-revolt, cons. suff. in the time of Domitianus; Maximus Antonius Primus,<sup>32</sup> the commanding officer of the legio septima Galbiana in Pannonia; he occupied Rome for the Flavians, and became consul; the famous orator Aquilius Regulus,<sup>33</sup> the confidant of Domitianus; the Roman knight Iulius Martialis,<sup>34</sup> the consular Domitius Afer Lucanus and his brother Gnaeus Tullus.<sup>35</sup>

It is worth seeing whether these 9 persons occur in the works of the poet's two great contemporaries, Tacitus and Pliny. After examining this question we may report the following data: Pliny does not mention Arruntius Stella, Stertinius Avitus, Maximus Antonius Primus, Iulius Martialis and Appius Maximus Norbanus. He abuses Aquilius Regulus<sup>36</sup> and the brothers Domitius Afer Lucanus and Gnaeus Tullus.<sup>37</sup> Only Licinius Sura enjoys a high reputation with him.<sup>38</sup> Tacitus keeps silent about Arruntius Stella, Stertinius Avitus, A. M. Norbanus, Licinius Sura, Domitius Afer and Tullus. He describes Aquilius Regulus as dishonest,<sup>39</sup> Antonius Primus as cruel and ambitious. He remarks on his having been condemned for falsification.<sup>40</sup> He mentions Iulius Martialis neutrally.

The picture emerging from the epigrams of Martial, on the one hand, and from Pliny's and Tacitus' work, on the other, is rather contradictory. Tacitus and Pliny must have known the unmentioned persons, for most of them may have been their official colleagues, and if they did not mention them, the reason for that must have been that these persons didn't belong to their intimate friends or to that political group whose members were Tacitus and Pliny. This can be concluded from the career of those persons whom Martial praises, but Pliny and Tacitus disparage. E. g., Martial mentions Domitius Afer and his brother Tullus as the ideals of honesty and fraternal affection, and he presents their virtue as being widely known, so that he puts them in a simile: *Si, Lucane, tibi vel si tibi, Tulle darentur / qualia Ledaei fata Lacones habent, / nobilis haec esset pietatis rixa* doubt (1,36,1–4); *pietate fratres Curvius licet vincas* (5,28,3). On the other hand, in Pliny's opinion they are ignominious; they acquired an immense fortune and, by evading the law, united it.<sup>41</sup> When Tullus died, his Last Will produced a sensation, and this gave an opportunity to Pliny to make their deeds widely known. Both of them may have owed their uprise to Vespasianus, under Domitianus they became consuls, then proconsuls. They were loyal men of Domitianus, and as such they must have been opponents of the philosophical opposition which threatened the reign of the Flavii, in particular, that of Domitianus.<sup>42</sup>

The character of Aquilius Regulus is even more instructive. In Martial's opinion he is the greatest orator of Rome: he has ingenium, he is modern, bewitching, and even his style answers to the requirements of the new times.<sup>43</sup> It is evident from some remarks of Pliny, too, that Regulus as an orator represented the ideal of style contrasting with that of Cicero. His speeches were spirited with excessive emotion, and sometimes he used unspeakable words.<sup>44</sup> Tacitus, too, mentions him among the greatest orators in the *Dialogus*, but remarks that he used his talent to ruin honest men.<sup>45</sup> The horrible stories narrated by Pliny about the infamy of Regulus, in our opinion, cannot be regarded as trustworthy. In the negative Regulus-portrait drawn by Pliny and Tacitus there is a lot of calumny due to the political opponent. In Rome, from time immemorial, the invective was cultivated, its main aim being to ruin the reputation of the attacked persons in a form determined by the genre of the political pamphlet.<sup>46</sup> It is evident on the basis of Pliny's letters, that Regulus was an adversary of the senatorial opposition, Rusticus and Senecio (1,5; 4,7; 6,2), and in Pliny's opinion he had a hand in their condemnation: *Rustici Aruleni periculum foverat, exultaverat morte, adeo ut librum recitaret publicaretque, in quo Rusticum insectatur atque etiam „Stoicorum simiam“ appellat* (1,5,2).

Regulus named Rusticus a Stoic ape, and presumably, depicted him as a dishonest pusher, like Pliny did him, but — owing to the senatorial aristocracy — his works did not survive. On the basis of the above-mentioned facts, we are near the truth if we suppose that the important persons mentioned by Martial as his patrons or friends faced the senatorial opposition, and against them they acted on behalf of the Flavii.

It is striking, that Pliny who was in tight connection with the members of the senatorial opposition and he himself was a Stoic, praises the poet who was rather an Epicurean, and stood near the circle loyal to Domitianus. It is also an important fact that Pliny disdained the patrons and the friends of Martial, however, he did not say anything harming the poet's honesty. It is rather strange, because he found a spot on the honesty of such a great aristocrat as Silius Italicus. He writes about him in his necrology already cited: *Laeserat famam suam sub Nerone: credebatur sponte accusasse* (3,7,3). He says the same about him as about Regulus: he was an accuser during Nero's time. The fact that he praised the poet who stood on a lower social level than he did, can only be explained if we assume that Pliny held Martial a great poet,<sup>47</sup> and regarded him in the framework of short poetry as his ideal of the slender genre,<sup>48</sup> and that in the poet's life he never knew anything that would have made a spot on his honesty.



- <sup>1</sup> A. N. Sherwin-White: *The letters of Pliny*. Oxford 1966. 262–263.
- <sup>2</sup> G. Highet: *Juvenal the Satirist*. Oxford 1954. 2.: *the first prominent critic to take a serious interest in him was Servius*.
- <sup>3</sup> Cf. M. V. Martialis epigrammaton libri XIII summa diligentia castigati. Parisiis 1533.
- <sup>4</sup> M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammata cum notis Farnabii et variorum, Geminioque Indice tum Rerum tum Auctorum. Accurante Cornelio Schrevelio. Lugd. Batavorum 1970. 3.
- <sup>5</sup> Matthaei Raderi de Societate Jesu ad M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libros omnes, Plenis commentariis, novo studio confectis, explicatos, emendatos, illustratos... Excudebat Hermannus Meresius. Moguntiae 1627. 7.
- <sup>6</sup> D. Nisard: *Études sur les poètes latins*. I. Paris 1888<sup>5</sup>. 359.
- <sup>7</sup> E. Syme: *Tacitus*. Oxford 1958. 97.
- <sup>8</sup> I. Borzsák: *EPHk* 63 (1939) 143–153.
- <sup>9</sup> Cited in the edition of Lemair: M. V. Martialis Epigrammata ad codices Parisinos accurate recensita. Parisiis 1825. LVIII–LIX.
- <sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* LIX.
- <sup>11</sup> G. Bernhardt: *Grundriss der römischen Literatur*. Braunschweig 1865<sup>4</sup>. 620–21.
- <sup>12</sup> E. Paratore: *La letteratura latina dell'età imperiale*. Firenze–Milano 1969.<sup>8</sup> 155–158.
- <sup>13</sup> L. Bieler: *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. II. Berlin 1972.<sup>3</sup> 91.
- <sup>14</sup> O. Seel: *Ansatz zu einer Martial-Interpretation. Das Epigramm*. Herausgegeben von G. Pfohl. Darmstadt 1969. 174.
- <sup>15</sup> J. W. Duff: *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age*. London. 1960.<sup>2</sup> 20.
- <sup>16</sup> *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford 1968. 32.
- <sup>17</sup> Modern scholars do not emphasize the satirical element in Martial's poetry, excepting J. W. Duff who devotes a chapter to Martial in his book: *Roman Satire*. Connecticut 1964. 126–146.
- <sup>18</sup> D. Nisard: *op. cit.* 359.
- <sup>19</sup> K. – H. Mehnert: *Sal Romanus und esprit français*. Bonn 1970. 25.
- <sup>20</sup> K. E. Georges: *Ausführliches Lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch*. I. Leipzig 1879.<sup>7</sup> 894.
- <sup>21</sup> F. Quadlbauer: *Fons purus. Zu seiner stilkritischen Verwendung bei Quintilian und Martial*. Festschrift K. Vretska. Heidelberg 1970. 181–194.
- <sup>22</sup> Plin. N. H. 34.82.
- <sup>23</sup> G. Luck: *The Latin Love Elegy*. London 1959. 71–72.
- <sup>24</sup> Cf. U. Scamuzzi: *RSC* 65 (1970) 345–357.
- <sup>25</sup> Cf. W. Allen: *CJ* 65 (1970) 345–357.
- <sup>26</sup> E. Paratore: *op. cit.* 158–159.
- <sup>27</sup> O. Seel: *op. cit.* 166.
- <sup>28</sup> PIR I. 227–228. Cf. Stat. Silv. 1.2,70–72; Mart. 1,7; 44; 61; 4,6; 5,11; 12; 59; 6,21; 47; 7,14; 36; 8,78; 9,42; 55; 89; 11,52; 52; 12,24; 75.
- <sup>29</sup> PWRE II. R. III. 2453. Cf. Mart. 1,16; 6,84; praef. 9; 10,96; 102; 12,24; 75.
- <sup>30</sup> PIR IV. 214–216; PWRE XIII. 471. Cf. Mart. 1,49; 6,64; 7,47.
- <sup>31</sup> PWRE II. 1243–44. Cf. Mart. 9,84.
- <sup>32</sup> Tac. Ann. 14,40; Hist. 2,86; 3,28; 49; 53; 4,80. PIR I. 168–69; cf. Mart. 9,99; 10,23; 32; 73.
- <sup>33</sup> Tac. Hist. 4,42; Plin. Ep. 1,5; 2,11; 20; 4,2; 7; 6,2; PIR I. 196–7; cf. Mart. 1,12; 82; 11; 2,74; 93; 4,16; 5,10; 21; 28; 63; 6,38; 64; 7,16; 31.
- <sup>34</sup> Mart. 1,15; 3,5; 4,64; 5,20; 6,1; 7,17; 9,97; 10,47; 11,80; 12,34.
- <sup>35</sup> N. Sherwin-White: *op. cit.* 468–71; Mart. 1,36; 3,20; 8,75; 9,51; 5,28, 3.
- <sup>36</sup> Plin. Ep. 1,5; 2,11; 20; 4,2; 7; 6,2.
- <sup>37</sup> Plin. Ep. 8,18.
- <sup>38</sup> 4,30; 7,27.
- <sup>39</sup> Tac. Hist. 4,42; Dial. 15.
- <sup>40</sup> Tac. Ann. 14,40; Hist. 2,86; 3,28; 49; 53; 4,80.
- <sup>41</sup> N. Sherwin-White: *op. cit.* 468–71.

<sup>42</sup> *M. Rostortzeff*: Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft im römischen Kaiserreich. Leipzig 1929. I. 96–102.

<sup>43</sup> Mart. 4,16,5; 5,21,1–2; 5,63,4; 6,64,11.

<sup>44</sup> Plin. Ep. 15,2–3; 4,7; 6,2.

<sup>45</sup> Tac. Dial. 15.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. C. Sallustius Crispus: *Invective und Episteln*. Herausg. von K. Vretska. I–II. Heidelberg 1961; and the *Philippica* of Cicero.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. R. Syme: *op. cit.* 97: "Statius and Martial left a gap behind them. It is not fanciful to discover in Pliny their successor as a social commentator ... Like Martial, Pliny wrote on minor themes with high polish and an artist's single-minded devotion".

<sup>48</sup> A. M. Guillemin: *Pline et la vie littéraire de son temps*. Paris 1929. 147: "Pour Pline, le véritable maître de la composition est Martial. Il l'imite dans l'ensemble et dans le détail et à travers lui, il subit l'influence de tous les modèles dont Martial concentre, résume et achève l'effort vers la brièveté."